

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated April 22, 2003, having a shortened statutory period set to expire on July 22, 2003 in which,

Claims 1-56 were pending; and

Claims 1-56 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 11, 24, 25, 39, and 40 have been amended, Claims 2 and 12 have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added by this response. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-11, and 13-56 remain currently pending in the present application.

Formal Matters

Applicants wish to express their appreciation for the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the Examiner Interview Teleconference of July 2, 2003. While specific agreement as to Applicants' claims was not reached during the teleconference Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks made herein are in harmony with the opinions expressed by the Examiner therein.

Examiner's Response to Arguments

In the present Final Office Action the Examiner states, "Regarding Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9 applicant argued that APA (Admitted Prior Art) [Yunoki, U.S. Patent 5408518] does not teach or fails to describe..." in responding to Applicants' prior remarks (Applicants' response to non-final Office Action dated February 3, 2003). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assessment of the Yunoki reference as "Admitted Prior Art". As discussed in the teleconference of July 2, 2003, Applicants refer the Examiner to page 15 of Applicants' prior response which states that, "While not conceding that the cited reference qualifies as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to traverse the claim rejections as follows."

Applicants also note that the Examiner fails to explicitly reference elements of Applicants' claims in his response to Applicants' arguments stating,

APA (admitted prior art) clearly teaches the teleconference system comprises a teleconference registration device for registering, in the telephone service system, a reservation for a teleconference run by any of the users of the group of terminals, for notifying all teleconference participants of the teleconference run, for responding to a status confirmation request for the date and time of the teleconference run, and for notifying an attending teleconference participant of a teleconference participant who will be absent. A teleconference run device holds a teleconference by automatically connecting all attending teleconference participants online on the date and time of the teleconference run registered by the teleconference registration device....

Applicants clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts...Therefore the examiner asserts that APA does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent Claims 1, 11, 24, and 39. Dependent claims 2-10, 12-23, 25-38, and 40-56 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reason set forth in the previous office action.

Applicants respectfully request clarification as to how the Examiner believes the elements referenced by the Examiner above correspond to Applicants' claims and that the Examiner cite with specificity that portion of the reference(s) which teach, show, or suggest the described elements as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2).

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the present Office Action, Claims 1-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,408,518, issued to Yunoki (hereinafter, "*Yunoki*"). While not conceding that the cited reference qualifies as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to overcome in part and traverse in part the claim rejections as follows. The following arguments are made without prejudice to Applicants' right to establish, for example in a continuing application, that the cited reference does not qualify as prior art with respect to an invention embodiment currently or subsequently claimed.

Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 12 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein and consequently submit that all rejections, including those under 35 U.S.C. §102 are rendered moot with respect to those claims.

As discussed by the Examiner and Applicants' representative in the Examiner Interview Teleconference of July 2, 2003, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite,

“directing a token generator to issue a token to the first network station client” as well as, “adding the first network station client to the conference call...utilizing said token. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s cited reference, *Yunoki*, fails to teach, show, or suggest the described claim limitations as required by Applicants’ claim 1 and generally required by Applicants’ claims 11, 24, and 39, as amended.

With regard to “directing” the present Final Office Action repeats the non-final Office Action of October 23, 2002, stating that, “Yunoki teaches and describes a system and method extending a persistent invitation to a first network station client to join a conference call...wherein: -directing a token generator to issue the persistent invitation to the first network station client in response to user input to a second network station client (Fig. 5, col. 14 line 35 to col. 16 line 67)...” Applicants respectfully request that in any subsequent action the Examiner cite with specificity that portion of Figure 5 and columns 14, 15, and 16 within *Yunoki* which teach, show, or suggest the above-described amended claim elements as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2).

No part of *Yunoki* teaches or suggests a “token” or a “token generator” as claimed. Moreover, the Examiner fails to point to any of the numerous features described in column 14, line 35 through column 16, line 67 as teaching or suggesting a token or token generator. Thus the Examiner has provided no basis for his contention that the cited portion of *Yunoki* teaches the Applicants’ claimed directing, and it is the Applicant’s position that *Yunoki* does not teach or suggest “directing a token generator to issue a token to the first network station client in response to user input to a second network station client” as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable over *Yunoki*.

Applicants’ claims 3-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least those reasons stated for the allowability of that claim. Applicants’ claims 11, 24, and 39 contain one or more limitation substantially similar to those of claim 1 and are therefore, along with corresponding dependent claims 13-23, 25-38, and 40-56, similarly allowable for at least those reasons stated for the allowability of that claim.

CONCLUSION


In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5097.

Express Mail Label No:

EV 304 736 876 US

July 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,


Justin M. Dillon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42, 486